

OCT-13-2006 10:14AM FROM-

T-428 P.003 F-710

OCT-11-2006 05:34PM FROM-

CT 10 2006 2:44 PM FR WASSERMAN COMDEN CASSEL 4098 TO 134822939 P.09

COPY

1 MELISSA M. HARNETT (Bar No. 164309; mhamett@wccclaw.com)
 2 WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 3 5567 Reseda Boulevard, Suite 330
 4 Post Office Box 7033
 5 Tarzana, California 91357-7033
 6 Telephone: (818) 705-6800 • (323) 872-0995
 7 Facsimile: (818) 345-0162

CONFIRMED COPY
 OF ORIGINAL FILED
 Los Angeles Superior Court

OCT 10 2006

John A. Clancy, Executive Officer/Clerk
 By E. C. C. Deputy
 E. C. C.

5 THE GARCIA LAW FIRM
 6 Stephen M. Garcia, State Bar No. 123338
 7 Sorina M. Hinson, State Bar No. 228255
 8 David M. Medby, State Bar No. 227401
 9 One World Trade Center, Suite 1950
 10 Long Beach, California 90831
 11 Telephone: (562) 216-5270
 12 Facsimile: (562) 216-5271

13 Attorneys for BRUCE SCHILLER, and
 14 VARIOUS PARTIES

FILE BY FAX

15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 16 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

17 BRUCE SCHILLER, an individual and on
 18 Behalf of all Others Similarly Situated,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 vs.

21 PLANTRONICS INC., a Delaware
 22 corporation, and DOES 1-50,

23 Defendants.

CASE NO. LC360076

CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT FOR:

1) VIOLATION OF CONSUMERS
 LEGAL REMEDIES ACT,
 (CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750 et seq.);

2) VIOLATION OF UNFAIR
 COMPETITION LAW,
 (CAL. B & P CODE § 17200 et seq.);

3) UNTRUE AND MISLEADING
 ADVERTISING
 (CAL. B & P CODE § 17500, et seq.)

4) UNJUST ENRICHMENT

5) BREACH OF EXPRESS
 WARRANTY

6) BREACH OF IMPLIED
 WARRANTY

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 5567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
 POST OFFICE BOX 7033
 TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:15AM FROM-

T-428 P.004 F-710

1 Plaintiff BRUCE SCHILLER ("Plaintiff"), individually and on behalf of others
2 similarly situated, brings this action against Defendant PLANTRONICS INC. and DOES 1
3 through 50 (jointly "Defendants"), demanding a trial by jury, as follows:

4
5 VENUE
6

7 1. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
8 § 395(b), in that this action arises from an offer or provision of goods intended primarily
9 for personal use. Plaintiff resided in the County of Los Angeles at the time that the
10 purchases of the goods at issue were made, and continues to live in the County of Los
11 Angeles at the present time. Plaintiff purchased the goods at issue in the County of Los
12 Angeles. At all relevant times, Defendants marketed and sold Bluetooth headset devices to
13 purchasers in California, including but not limited to, in the County of Los Angeles.

14
15 2. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this Class and the
16 representative action pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq. ("UCL"); Bus. &
17 Prof. Code § 17500, et seq.; Civ. Code § 1750, et seq.; Code of Civil Procedure § 382, and
18 other provisions of the California Codes.

19
20 THE PARTIES
21

22 3. Individual and representative plaintiff Bruce Schiller is a resident of the
23 County of Los Angeles, State of California.

24
25 4. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and on that basis allege that Defendant
26 Plantronics Inc. ("Plantronics") is a Delaware corporation, with its principal place of
27 business in California, registered to do business, and doing business, in the state of
28 California.

WASSERMAN, KMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
5567 REBEKA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:15AM FROM-

T-428 P.005 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 5. Plantronics is authorized to do business in California, has sufficient
2 minimum contacts with California, and/or otherwise intentionally avails itself of the
3 markets in California through the promotion, marketing and sale of its products in
4 California, to render the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court permissible under traditional
5 notions of fair play and substantial justice.

6
7 6. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or
8 otherwise of defendants DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of their roles in this case,
9 are unknown to Plaintiffs, who therefore sue said defendants by such fictitious names
10 pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 474. Plaintiffs further allege that each of said
11 fictitiously named defendants is in some manner responsible for the acts and occurrences
12 set forth herein. Plaintiffs will amend this Complaint to show their true names and
13 capacities when the same is ascertained, as well as the manner in which each fictitiously
14 named defendant is responsible.

15
16 7. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege that at all times
17 mentioned, that Defendants are each the partners, joint venturers, alter egos, and/or co-
18 conspirators of each other. At all times mentioned, there existed such a unity of interest in
19 ownership and interests between each of the Defendants that any separateness ceased to
20 exist between them. The exercise of complete dominance and control over the other
21 entities and their properties, rights and interests, rendered such entities as mere shells and
22 instrumentalities of each other Defendant.

23
24 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION**

25
26 8. This action arises from Defendants' marketing, manufacture, and distribution
27 of devices known as "Bluetooth Headsets" which permit wearers to utilize a mobile phone
28 without holding the phone next to the face and without the necessity of wires connecting

783382.1

3

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

OCT-13-2006 10:15AM FROM-

T-428 P.006/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
5367 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 350
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91377-7033

1 the phone to the headset.

2

3 9. Plantronics has manufactured and distributed many different models of
4 Bluetooth Headsets, including the Discovery 655 , Discovery 645 , Discovery 640 ,
5 Discovery 640E , Voyager 510 , Explorer 350 , Explorer 340 , and Explorer 330
6 (collectively the "Headsets"). On the packaging of these Headsets, Plantronics has made
7 false representations, omissions and concealments to purchasing consumers in order to
8 induce the consumers to purchase the product. Each Headset is sold with affirmative
9 representations that it can be used for extensive time periods, yet the packaging lacks any
10 warnings regarding the noise induced hearing loss, a condition which has no cure or
11 treatment, which can be expected to result from use of the Headsets in most environments
12 over that period of time.

13

14 10. Use of Bluetooth headsets is becoming increasingly popular among the
15 consuming public because of the ease and convenience associated with the technology.
16 According to the Insight Research Corporation ("IRC"), "[n]early 65 percent of
17 Americans, or 195 million people, are expected to be mobile phone subscribers by the
18 close of 2005." IRC has also reported that "[a]s users become more used to the
19 convenience of cellular, long distance and local usage is shifting from wireline to cellular.
20 The average wireline residential toll minutes of use (MOUs) have been dropping at a
21 compounded rate of 15 percent since 2000, while wireless interstate MOUs per user grew
22 at a compounded rate of nearly 40 percent during the same period. According to one FCC
23 study, on the wireless side, the percentage of interstate residential minutes has increased
24 from 16 percent to 26 percent of all wireless minutes." As more and more people switch
25 from using landlines to using mobile phones in order to accommodate their
26 telecommunication needs, more and more consumers are spending hours per day on the
27 mobile phone. Such increased usage is particularly dramatic with respect to individuals
28 using a mobile phone for business purposes.

783382.1

4

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

OCT-13-2006 10:15AM FROM-

T-428 P.007/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3967 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 390
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

11. As explained by the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) (www.nidcd.nih.gov/health/hearing/noise.asp), "[h]earing is a series of events in which the ear converts sound waves into electrical signals that are sent to the brain and interpreted as sound. The ear has three main parts: the outer, middle, and inner ear. Sound waves enter through the outer ear and reach the middle ear where they cause the eardrum to vibrate." Noise induced hearing loss "can be caused by . . . repeated exposure to sounds at various loudness levels over an extended period of time."

12. "The vibrations are transmitted through three tiny bones in the middle ear, called the ossicles. These three bones are named the malleus, incus, and stapes (and are also known as the hammer, anvil, and stirrup). The eardrum and ossicles amplify the vibrations and carry them to the inner ear. The stirrup transmits the amplified vibrations through the oval window and into the fluid that fills the inner ear. The vibrations move through fluid in the snail-shaped hearing part of the inner ear (cochlea) that contains the hair cells. The fluid in the cochlea moves the top portion of the hair cells, called the hair bundle, which initiates the changes that lead to the production of nerve impulses. These nerve impulses are carried to the brain, where they are interpreted as sound. Different sounds move the hair bundles in different ways, thus allowing the brain to distinguish one sound from another, such as vowels from consonants."

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes that noise induced hearing loss is the slow loss of hearing caused by too much noise. Hearing loss happens when too much noise hurts the hair cells in the inner ear. Noise induced hearing loss is one of the most common causes of nerve deafness. Noise induced hearing loss lasts forever. There is no treatment, no medicine, no surgery, and no device which can correct hearing once damaged by noise.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes that noise induced hearing loss can happen gradually over time and does not cause pain. As such, one is not aware that noise induced

OCT-13-2006 10:15AM FROM-

T-429 P.008/051 F-710

1 hearing loss is occurring until it is too late. Because noise induced hearing loss is an
2 insidiously developing hearing impairment, damage occurs prior to the point at which it is
3 perceived.

4
5 15. Noise induced hearing loss can also result because an individual has become
6 accustomed to a particular sound level. As the individual gradually suffers hearing loss, in
7 an effort to compensate for the decrease in ability to hear, the individual unwittingly
8 increases the volume of a device in order to hear the sound produced and thereby
9 compounds the injury.

10
11 16. Another organization, Dangerous Decibels, a public health partnership for
12 the prevention of noise induced hearing loss, advises the public that "[a] dangerous sound
13 is anything that is 85 dB (sound pressure level - SPL) or higher." The organization further
14 explains that "[o]f the roughly 40 million Americans suffering from hearing loss, 10
15 million can be attributed to noise-induced hearing loss (NIHL). NIHL can be caused by a
16 one-time exposure to loud sound as well as by repeated exposure to sounds at various
17 loudness levels over an extended period of time."

18
19 17. Exposure to a time weighted average decibel level by itself can cause harm.
20 One knowledgeable organization, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and
21 Health (NIOSH), has offered the view that exposure to sound averaging at 85 decibels for
22 more than 8 hours a day by itself presents a risk of hearing loss. According to NIOSH,
23 each three decibel volume increase reduces the safe exposure time by half, which reflects
24 the logarithmic nature of the decibel scale. For example, if a Headset set on the higher
25 volume level produces decibel levels of 91 decibels, noise induced hearing loss statistically
26 develops if the Headset is used for more than two hours a day. At 94 decibels, noise
27 induced hearing loss statistically develops if the Headset is used for more than one hour a
28 day. At 102 decibels, irreversible damage statistically develops if the Headset is used for

783382.1

6

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, LLP.
9987 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91397-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:15AM FROM-

T-428 P:008/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELLMAN, L.L.P.
5587 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91397-7033

1 more than 7 ½ minutes per day.

2
3 18. Plantronics' Headsets have volume controls which produce sounds exceeding
4 85 decibels, with sound often peaking in excess of 100 decibels. According to the
5 standards promulgated by such organizations as NIOSH and Dangerous Decibels, a
6 consumer statistically develops NIHL if exposed to such sounds for less than 15 minutes a
7 day. Further, the consumer cannot determine, without resorting to scientific testing, the
8 decibel level of the sound being emitted from the Headset.

9
10 19. The packaging on the Headsets advises that the Headsets can be used for
11 "extended talk time." The various models indicate talk time of 3 hours, 6 hours, 8 hours, 9
12 hours, 10 hours, and even 15 hours. However, the representations as to permissible talk
13 times are false, as a consumer cannot safely use the Headsets for the talk times
14 represented. Plaintiffs and the Class members relied upon these representations made by
15 Defendants in determining whether to purchase the Headsets at the high price charged for
16 the devices.

17
18 20. Millions of consumers have had their hearing put at risk by Plantronics'
19 conduct. Plaintiff and the class members detrimentally relied upon the affirmative
20 misrepresentations, omissions and concealments made by Defendants regarding the
21 permissible use of the product. Plaintiff and the class members further relied upon
22 Defendants' skill and judgment to furnish suitable goods which would not cause harm to
23 the consumer, and to warn the consumer of any information known by Defendants, or
24 which should reasonably have been known by Defendants, relating to the safe operation of
25 the product.

26
27 21. Defendants sold the Headsets with a booklet setting forth "important safety
28 and operational information" relating to use of the Headsets. However, Defendants

783382.1

7

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

OCT-13-2006 10:16AM FROM-

T-429 P.010/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
5587 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 omitted and concealed from consumers any safety information pertaining to the Headsets'
2 propensity for causing noise induced hearing loss. Defendants also omitted and concealed
3 from the consuming public information advising that the Headsets produced noise at
4 decibel levels exceeding 85 db, and even exceeding 100 db.

5
6 22. The same misrepresentations, omissions and concealments were made in the
7 product packaging to each consumer who purchased the product. Plaintiff and the class
8 members relied upon the misrepresentations, omissions and concealments in purchasing
9 the Headsets.

10
11 23. Because the Headset transmits sound to only one ear, extraneous sound from
12 the environment is simultaneously being heard by the Headset user from the other ear.
13 Such ambient sound makes it more difficult for the Headset user to isolate and hear the
14 sound being transmitted over the Headset. The Headset user is thus required to maximize
15 the volume of the Headset in order to overcome the extraneous noise being heard in the
16 other ear.

17
18 24. Plaintiff purchased and used a Headset manufactured and distributed by
19 Defendants. Plaintiff was not aware that the Headset was emitting sounds in excess of safe
20 decibel levels which thereby required the time the product could safely be used to be
21 greatly minimized. Plaintiff would not have purchased the Headset, including at the price
22 charged, if Defendants had disclosed the truth.

23
24 25. The design, manufacture, distribution and sale by Defendants of the Headsets
25 without adequate warning labels that the Headsets produce decibel levels harmful to the
26 human ear constitutes deceptive and unlawful business practices. As a result of
27 Defendants' conduct, numerous consumers have paid for an unsafe product which they
28 falsely were led to believe could be safely used for extended periods of time.

783382.1

8

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

OCT-13-2006 10:15AM FROM-

T-428 P.011/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3367 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 26. Despite the information provided by Plantronics in its "safety booklet,"
2 Plantronics fails to divulge the decibel output of the device and the potential for noise
3 induced hearing loss if the Headset is used at a loud setting for more than a safe number of
4 hours per day. The exclusion of such information from the safety information in the
5 booklet wrongly implies that the Headset is safe at its maximum volume for the hours of
6 talk time permitted by the Headset. The safety book falsely represents to consumers that
7 the "important" information provided in the booklet permits the "safe and efficient
8 operation" of the Headset. This representation is false, as important safety information has
9 been excluded from the booklet. Plaintiffs and the Class members relied upon such
10 misrepresentations, omissions and concealments to their detriment.

11
12 27. Plantronics affirmatively represented that the Headsets are warranted to be
13 free from "defects in materials and workmanship." This representation was and is false.
14 The Headsets are defective and cannot safely be used for their intended purpose. The
15 materials and workmanship of the product cause the product to produce unsafe decibel
16 levels under normal consumer usage.

17
18 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the Headsets can be used to listen to
19 music or television downloaded onto mobile phones. Because of these new uses for the
20 mobile phone, the time over which the Headsets are used is increased significantly. The
21 decibel levels of the music or television also exceeds 85 decibel levels, and may even
22 reach levels capable of producing hearing loss from a single exposure to the loud sound
23 emitted.

24
25 29. Other manufacturers of music listening devices, such as Apple with respect
26 to its iPod, include a warning so that consumers are aware of the potential for hearing
27 damage. For example, the iPod is sold with the following warning:
28

DCT-13-2006 10:16AM FROM-

T-428 P.012/051 F-710

1 **Avoid Hearing Damage**

2 Warning: Permanent hearing loss may occur if earphones or
3 headphones are used at high volume. You can adapt over time to a
4 higher volume of sound, which may sound normal but can be
5 damaging to your hearing. Set your iPod's volume to a safe level
6 before that happens. If you experience ringing in your ears, reduce
7 the volume or discontinue use of your iPod.

8 The Headsets manufactured, distributed and sold by Defendants, which contain no such
9 warnings, thus fail to follow industry standards for music listening devices.

10 30. Plaintiff seeks, on behalf of himself and the Class as defined below,
11 injunctive relief, product repair, restitution, damages, and all other appropriate relief.
12 Defendants misrepresented the time period over which consumers could safely use the
13 Headsets. In marketing and advertising the Headsets, Defendants also concealed and
14 omitted material information as to the capacity for the Headsets to cause hearing loss.
15 Plaintiff and the Class members thus: (1) cannot safely use the Headsets for the length of
16 time for which the Headsets were advertised as usable; or (2) must turn the volume of the
17 Headsets so low as to render the Headsets unusable in most environments, thereby
18 drastically limiting and/or eliminating the usability of the product. Had Plaintiff and the
19 Class they seek to represent known the true facts, they would not have purchased them or
20 would have purchased them only at a lesser price. Plaintiff, and the Class Members, thus
21 lost money as a result of the misrepresentations, omissions and concealments by
22 Defendants. In doing the acts herein alleged and purposefully risking the health and safety
23 of millions of consumers in order to increase sales and profits, Defendants, and each of
24 them, acted with oppression, fraud or malice, and Plaintiff and the Class members are
25 entitled to punitive damages.

26 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

27 31. Plaintiff brings this action both on behalf of himself, and as a class action
28

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3367 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:16AM FROM-

T-428 P.013/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, CONDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
5567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 on behalf of the following Class (the "Class"):

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

All consumers who, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint ("Class Period"), purchased a Bluetooth Headset device manufactured by Defendant and who resided in California.

Said definition may be further defined by additional pleadings, evidentiary hearings, a class certification hearing, and order of this Court.

32. Although Plaintiff does not know the exact number of the members of the Class, since such information is within the exclusive control of Defendants, Plaintiff believes that due to the nature of the commerce involved, the number of members of the Class are sufficiently numerous, most likely thousands of purchasers, that joinder of all Class members is impracticable.

33. The claims of Plaintiff are typical of the Class claims. Plaintiff purchased a Headset manufactured by Plantronics within the Class Period. The unsafe Headset was unfairly and falsely marketed by Defendants, with the same misrepresentations, omissions and concealments made as to Plaintiff and the Class members. All Class members purchased the Product within the Class Period.

34. Numerous questions of law and fact are common to the Class, which predominate over any individual issues. Questions of law and fact which are common to the Class include, without limitation:

- a. Whether Defendants represented to consumers that the Headsets had a characteristic, use, benefit or quality that

OCT-13-2008 10:16AM FROM-

T-428 P.014/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 3567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
 POST OFFICE BOX 7033
 TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91377-7033

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

permitted a consumer to use the Headsets for an extended amount of time;

b. Whether the Headsets in fact have a characteristic, use, benefit or quality that prevents a consumer from safely using the Headsets for an extended amount of time;

c. Whether use of the Headsets expose users to dangerous levels of sound;

d. Whether Defendants failed to fairly, accurately and sufficiently warn of the unsafe characteristics of the Headsets;

e. Whether Defendant knowingly concealed the danger of using the Headsets;

f. Whether Defendants truthfully advertised that the Headsets could safely be used for over 8 hours of time;

g. Whether Defendants violated express and implied warranty statutes;

h. Whether Defendants were unjustly enriched;

i. The nature and extent of damages and other remedies to which the conduct of Defendants entitle the Class members;

j. Whether the distribution of the Headsets to the consuming

OCT-13-2006 10:17AM FROM-

T-428 P.015/051 F-710

1 public constitutes an illegal nuisance.

2
3 35. Defendants engaged in a common course of conduct involving similar or
4 identical unsafe designs, statutory violations, and misrepresentations. Individual
5 questions, if any, pale by comparison to the numerous questions that dominate this
6 litigation. The claims at issue herein do not seek damages for physical injury which has
7 already occurred to the Class members, and thus individualized determination as to
8 causation related to bodily injury already suffered will not be required. The monetary
9 damages sustained by the Class members arise from a common nucleus of operative facts
10 involving the Defendants' misconduct.

11
12 36. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Class in that
13 Plaintiff, a California resident, is a typical purchaser of the Headsets. Plaintiff's interests
14 do not conflict with the interests of the other Class members that he seeks to represent.
15 Furthermore, Plaintiff has retained competent counsel experienced in class action
16 litigation. Plaintiff's counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.

17
18 37. This class action is superior to the alternatives, if any, for the fair and
19 efficient adjudication of this controversy. The Class is readily definable. A class action
20 will enable claims to be handled in an orderly and expeditious manner. A class action will
21 save time and expense and will ensure uniformity of decisions.

22
23 38. The relief sought per individual member of the Class is small given the
24 burden and expense of individual prosecution of the potentially extensive litigation
25 necessitated by the conduct of Defendants. Furthermore, it would be virtually impossible
26 for the Class members to seek redress on an individual basis. Even if the Class members
27 themselves could afford such individual litigation, the court system could not.

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3567 REYES BLVD., SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:17AM FROM-

T-428 P.016/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 5587 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 390
 POST OFFICE BOX 7038
 TARTANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7038

39. The Class members have been monetarily damaged and suffered injury in fact as a result of Defendants' misconduct in that each member purchased an unsafe Headset which the member would not have purchased if the true facts as to the product's safety and limitations had been revealed by Defendants. The Class members would not have purchased the Headsets and/or paid as much had they known the truth about the product.

40. Individual litigation of the legal and factual issues raised by the conduct of Defendants would increase delay and expense to all parties and to the court system. The class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of a single, uniform adjudication, economies of scale and comprehensive supervision by a single court. Given the similar nature of the Class members' claims and the law applicable thereto, the Court and the parties will easily be able to manage a class action.

41. Prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for the Defendants.

42. Injunctive relief is appropriate as to the Class as a whole because Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class.

CALIFORNIA C.C.P. § 382 COMMON OR GENERAL INTEREST

ALLEGATIONS

43. In addition to asserting class action claims in this action, Plaintiff asserts claims on behalf of the common or general interest and sue for the benefit of all because the parties are numerous, and it is impracticable to bring them all before the court. Plaintiff seeks to require Defendants to disgorge and restore all monies wrongfully

OCT-13-2006 10:17AM FROM-

T-428 P.017/051 F-710

1 obtained. A common or general interest action is necessary and appropriate because
2 Defendants have engaged and continue to engage in the wrongful acts described herein as
3 a general business practice.

4
5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
6 **VIOLATION OF THE CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT,**
7 **(CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750 et seq.)**

8
9 44. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all the above allegations as if fully set
10 forth herein.

11
12 45. Plaintiff and members of the Class are individuals who have purchased
13 goods (i.e., the Headsets) for personal, family or household purposes. This cause of action
14 is being asserted on behalf of a sub-class of all persons who purchased a Headset within
15 three years of the filing of this action.

16
17 46. Defendants have represented that the Headsets have characteristics, uses,
18 benefits, or qualities that they do not have, in violation of Civil Code § 1770(a)(5).
19 Defendants also represented that the Headsets had a particular standard or quality that they
20 do not have in violation of Civil Code § 1 770(a)(7).

21
22 47. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have each been directly and
23 proximately injured by the conduct of Defendants, and such injury includes payment for
24 the unsafe Headsets.

25
26 48. In accordance with California Civil Code § 1780 (a), Plaintiff and the
27 members of the Class seek only injunctive relief as to Defendants' violation of the CLRA.
28 Pursuant to the provisions of Civil Code section 1782, on October 9, 2006, Plaintiff sent by

OCT-13-2006 10:17AM FROM-

T-429 P.018/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 3567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 300
 POST OFFICE BOX 7033
 TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

certified letter to Plantronics a demand that it adequately correct, repair, replace or otherwise rectify the deceptive practices described in this Complaint for the entire Class, pursuant to Civil Code section 1770. In accordance with Civil Code § 1782 (a) & (d), Plaintiff will subsequently amend this Class Action Complaint without leave of Court to include a request for damages if Defendants fail to adequately correct, repair replace or otherwise rectify the deceptive practices, described in this Complaint and the certified letter, for the entire Class.

49. The Court should enjoin the Defendants from any further sales, marketing or advertisement of the Headsets which contain the misrepresentations detailed herein as to the standard, characteristics, uses, benefits, and/or qualities of the Headsets. The Court should enjoin Defendants from any further sales, marketing or advertisement of the Headsets without a warning as to the potential for noise induced hearing loss. The Court should further enjoin Defendants from any further sales of the Headsets until Defendant redesigns the Headsets in a manner which ensures that the volume emitted by the Headsets does not exceed 85 decibels or, in the alternative, which provides the consumer with the ability to determine the decibel level of the sound being emitted by the Headset.

50. Plaintiff engaged counsel to prosecute this action and is entitled to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at trial.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

VIOLATION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW, (CAL. B & P CODE § 17200 et seq.)

51. Plaintiff incorporate by reference all the above allegations as if fully set forth herein, except for paragraphs 44 through 50.

OCT-13-2006 10:17AM FROM-

T-429 P.019/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, CONDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3567 REBECCA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 52. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of himself and on behalf of the
2 Class. Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered injury in fact and lost money or
3 property as a result of unfair competition by Defendants, as Plaintiff and the Class
4 members paid the purchase price for an unsafe product which would not have been
5 purchased if Defendants had not made misrepresentations and concealed or omitted
6 material information as to the safety of the product and its limitations. Plaintiff and the
7 Class members relied upon Defendants to disclose all pertinent safety information and the
8 limitations on the safe usage of the product. Plaintiff and the Class members have further
9 suffered injury in fact having been subjected to a nuisance, as defined by California Civil
10 Code, section 3479, and as to which they were subjected by virtue of money innocently
11 paid in purchasing a product injurious to health so as to interfere with the comfortable
12 enjoyment of life.

13
14 53. The actions of Defendants, as complained herein, constitute unfair, deceptive
15 and unlawful practices committed in violation of the Unfair Competition Act. Plaintiff is
16 informed and believe that the conduct of Defendants violated the Unfair Competition Act
17 because:

- 18
19 a. Defendants were aware, or upon reasonable investigation
20 should have been aware, of the risks presented by the use of the
21 Headsets;
22
23 b. Defendants purposefully and knowingly failed to adequately
24 warn the consumer of the safety risk presented by use of the
25 Headset;
26
27 c. Defendants advertised and marketed the Headsets with a
28 representation that the Headsets could be used in excess of the

783382.1

17

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

OCT-13-2006 10:17AM FROM-

T-428 P.020/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
5567 REBECCA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91377-7033

1 number of hours which would be safe, even though Defendants
2 were aware or should have been aware that such use could be
3 unsafe;

4
5 d. Defendants failed to include in the safety information provided
6 with the Headsets any mention of the potential for noise
7 induced hearing loss, even though such a warning had been
8 issued by competitors;

9
10 e. Defendants concealed, omitted and/or suppressed
11 information as to the decibel levels emitted by the Headsets
12 and the corresponding time limitations for use;

13
14 f. Defendants have unlawfully violated regulations limiting
15 exposure to certain decibel levels over certain periods of time;

16
17 g. The Headsets, and Defendants' sale thereof to a considerable
18 number of persons, constitutes a nuisance because the Headsets
19 are injurious to health and/or interfere with the comfortable
20 enjoyment of life, in violation of California Civil Code § 3479;

21
22 h. Defendants' conduct violates maxims of jurisprudence,
23 including Civil Code §§ 3514, 3520, 3523.

24
25 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants are aware, or should be
26 aware, of the risk of hearing loss posed by the Headsets, but Defendants chose to market
27 and sell the Headsets without adequate warning or modifications because such warnings or
28 modifications could have had an adverse impact on the sale of the Headsets and the

783382.1

18

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

OCT-13-2006 10:17AM FROM-

T-428 P.021/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3367 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 revenue flowing to Defendants.

2
3 55. Plaintiff and the Class members have suffered damages as a result of the
4 conduct of Defendants, because Plaintiff and the Class members were misled into
5 purchasing a product which was not safe and which was not what Defendants advertised
6 the product to be.

7
8 56. Plaintiff is informed and believes that all of the conduct alleged herein
9 occurs and continues to occur in Defendants' business. The conduct of Defendants is part
10 of a pattern or generalized course of conduct repeated on thousands of occasions daily.

11
12 57. Plaintiff requests that this Court enter such orders or judgments as may be
13 necessary to restore to any person in interest any money which may have been acquired by
14 means of such unfair practices as provided in Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203, and for such
15 other relief as set forth below.

16
17 58. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the continuing sales of the Headsets to
18 the unsuspecting public, without warnings and any mechanism by which the public may
19 protect its hearing, exposes the consuming public in an ongoing danger of noise induced
20 hearing loss, an irreparable and devastating loss. Because the noise induced hearing loss at
21 issue herein is a silent condition (i.e., one is unaware that it is occurring as it evolves and
22 until it is too late) that progressively occurs over time, everyday the consuming public uses
23 the product, consumers continue down the path of noise induced hearing loss,
24 incrementally but permanently affecting and/or jeopardizing one's long-term ability to
25 hear. With every additional sale of the product, this path becomes increasingly congested.
26 Plaintiff requests that this Court enter a temporary restraining order, a preliminary
27 injunction, and a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, and their agents, servants,
28 employees and all persons acting under or in concert with them, to cease and desist from

783382.1

19

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT: DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

OCT-13-2006 10:18AM FROM-

T-429 P.022/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, COMIDY & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 5567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
 POST OFFICE BOX 7033
 TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 the following acts:

- 2
- 3 a. Selling, marketing or advertising the Headsets without a
- 4 warning advising the consumer as to the product's potential for
- 5 causing noise induced hearing loss;
- 6
- 7 b. Selling, marketing or advertising the Headsets without a
- 8 mechanism by which the user can determine the decibel levels
- 9 being emitted by the Headsets and thereby be made aware of
- 10 the safe time limits for use of the Headsets at the higher
- 11 volume settings;
- 12
- 13 c. Any other conduct which the Court determines warranted so as
- 14 to prevent the commission of unfair competition by
- 15 Defendants.
- 16

17 59. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, the Class, and on behalf of the common or
 18 general interest, seeks an order of this Court awarding restitution, injunctive relief and all
 19 other relief allowed under § 17200, *et seq.*, plus interest, attorneys' fees and costs pursuant
 20 to, *inter alia*, C.C.P. § 1021.5. Plaintiff engaged counsel to prosecute this action and is
 21 entitled to recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees according to proof at trial. This
 22 case will result in the enforcement of an important right affecting the public interest, a
 23 significant benefit (pecuniary or nonpecuniary) will be conferred on a large class of
 24 persons (thousands if not tens of thousands or more), the necessity and financial burden of
 25 private enforcement are such as to make the award appropriate (the product costs less than
 26 \$200, which is minimal in comparison to the financial burden of litigating this important
 27 action, made necessary by virtue of Plantronics' refusal to protect the public's hearing); and
 28 such fees should not in the interest of justice be paid out of the recovery, if any (as the cost

1 of litigation by itself may exceed the monetary amounts paid by way of restitution).

2

3 60. Plaintiff meets the standing requirements of C.C.P. § 382 to bring this cause
4 of action because, among other reasons, the question is one of a common or general
5 interest, is a question of many persons and/or the parties are numerous and it is
6 impracticable to bring them all before the Court. Further, Plaintiff has standing to bring
7 this action as Plaintiff suffered injury in fact and monetary damages as a result of
8 Defendants' conduct.

9

10 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **UNTRUE AND MISLEADING ADVERTISING**

12 **(CAL. B & P CODE § 17500, et seq.)**

13

14 61. Plaintiff incorporate by reference all the above allegations as if fully set forth
15 herein, except for paragraphs 44 through 50.

16

17 62. Plaintiff brings this cause of action on behalf of himself, on behalf of the
18 Class, and on behalf of the common or general interest. Plaintiff has suffered injury in fact
19 and lost money or property as a result of Defendants' violations of Bus. & Prof. Code §
20 17500. *et seq.*

21

22 63. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants made representations
23 disseminated to the public as to the uses of the Headsets in advertisements, product
24 descriptions and other sales materials, while also concealing and/or omitting relevant
25 information which would have qualified such affirmative representations. These
26 representations, omissions and concealments were made to induce the public to purchase
27 the Headsets. The representations were false. The information omitted and concealed
28 should have been disseminated.

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 350
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:18AM FROM-

T-428 P.024/051 F-710

WASSERMAN, CONDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 350
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

64. Defendants were aware, or by the exercise of reasonable case should have been aware, that the representations were untrue or misleading. Defendants also were aware, or by the exercise of reasonable case should have been aware, that the concealments and omissions should have been disseminated in the advertising.

65. Plaintiff has been harmed. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, on behalf of the Class, and on behalf of the common or general interest, seeks restitution, injunctive relief and all other relief allowable under § 17500, *et seq.*

66. Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 17535, Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to remedies as set forth below.

67. Plaintiff meets the standing requirements of C.C.P. § 382 to bring this cause of action because, among other reasons, the question is one of a common or general interest, is a question of many persons and/or the parties are numerous and it is impracticable to bring them all before the Court.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

UNJUST ENRICHMENT

68. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all the above allegations as if fully set forth herein, except for paragraphs 44 through 50.

69. Defendants have benefited and been unjustly enriched by the above-alleged conduct. Defendants knowingly sold the Headsets to Plaintiff and members of the Class based upon misrepresentations as to uses which the product did not possess and concealment and omission of information which should have been disseminated.

OCT-13-2006 10:18AM FROM-

T-429 P.025/051 F-710

70. Defendants have knowledge of this benefit, and have voluntarily accepted and retained this benefit.

71. The circumstances as described herein are such that it would be inequitable for Defendants to retain these ill-gotten benefits without paying the value thereof to Plaintiff and the Class members.

72. Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to the amount of Defendants' ill-gotten gains, including interest, resulting from its unlawful, unjust and inequitable conduct as described above.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION
BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY

(Cal. Civil Code § 1792.2 et seq.)

73. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all the above allegations as if fully set forth herein, except for paragraphs 44 through 50.

74. This claim is asserted on behalf of a sub-class of all persons whose express warranty is still in effect, i.e., Class members who purchased a headset within one year of the filing of this action.

75. Defendants expressly warranted that their products were free of defects in materials and workmanship.

76. Defendants' Headsets are defective in materials and/or workmanship.

77. Plaintiff and the Class members have incurred damages as described herein

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELLMAN, L.L.P.
5587 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 830
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:18AM FROM-

T-428 P.026/051 F-710

1 as a direct and proximate result of the defective Headsets and Defendants' violation of the
2 provisions of the Cal. Civ. Code § 1791.2, *et seq*, in that Plaintiff and the Class have paid
3 the purchase price for a product which cannot be safely used for the purpose and length of
4 time for which it was marketed and sold. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class
5 members, has requested that Defendants correct or repair the defects and Defendants have
6 refused. Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to refund of the purchase price of the
7 Product, consequential and incidental damages, costs and expenses, including attorney's
8 fees.

9
10 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**
11 **BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY**
12 **(Cal. Civil Code § 1790 *et seq.*)**
13

14 78. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all the above allegations as if fully set
15 forth herein, except for paragraphs 44 through 50.

16
17 79. This claim is asserted on behalf of a subclass of all purchasers of the
18 Headsets who purchased it within one year of the filing of this Complaint.

19
20 80. The Headsets are consumer goods as defined in Cal. Civil Code § 1791.

21
22 81. The Headsets were sold with the implied warranty of merchantability in that
23 they would pass without objection in the trade, are fit for the ordinary purpose for which
24 they are used, are adequately contained, packaged, and labeled, and conform to the
25 promises or affirmations of fact made on the container and label. The Headsets do not
26 meet any of the foregoing criteria.

27
28 82. The Headsets were sold with the implied warranty of fitness in that

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
5567 REBEKA BOULEVARD, SUITE 830
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

783382.1

24

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

WASSERMAN, COMMAN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
8967 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7083
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 Defendants had reason to know of the particular purpose for which the Headsets were
2 required (i.e., to listen safely to communications, music and television via mobile phones)
3 and Plaintiff and the Class members relied upon Defendants' skill and judgment to furnish
4 suitable goods. The Headsets are not suitable for the purpose for which they are required,
5 as Plaintiff and the Class members have no ability to determine the decibel levels being
6 emitted from the devices and the corresponding safe time during which Plaintiff and the
7 Class members may listen to the sound being emitted at such levels.

8
9 83. The defect in the Headsets existed prior to the delivery of the Headsets to
10 Plaintiff and the Class members.

11
12 84. Plaintiff and the Class members have incurred damages as described herein
13 as a direct and proximate result of the defective design of the Headsets and Defendants'
14 breach of the implied warranties, in that Plaintiff and the Class have paid the purchase
15 price for a product which cannot be safely used for the purpose and length of time for
16 which it was marketed and sold. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class members,
17 has requested that Defendants correct or repair the defects and Defendants have refused.
18 Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to refund of the purchase price of the Product,
19 consequential and incidental damages, costs and expenses, including attorney's fees.

20
21 PRAYER FOR RELIEF
22

23 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and as representative of all other
24 persons similarly situated, prays for judgment against the Defendants, as follows:

- 25
26 a. An Order certifying the Class and any appropriate sub-class
27 thereof, and appointing Plaintiff Bruce Schiller and his
28 counsel to represent the Class;

WASSERMAN, COHEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
5567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
PORT OFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91337-7033

- 1 b. As to the Fourth through Sixth Causes of Action, for an award
2 of general damages according to proof;
3
4 c. As to the Fourth through Sixth Causes of Action, for an award
5 of special damages according to proof;
6
7 d. As to the Fourth through Sixth Causes of Action, for an award
8 of punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter and make
9 an example of Defendants;
10
11 e. As to the Second through Sixth Causes of action, for an award
12 of restitution in an amount according to proof;
13
14 f. As to all causes of action, for a temporary restraining order, a
15 preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction enjoining
16 Defendants, and their agents, servants, employees and all
17 persons acting under or in concert with them, to cease and
18 desist from the following acts:
19
20 (i) Selling, marketing or advertising the Headsets without a
21 detailed warning advising the consumer as to the
22 potential for noise induced hearing loss and the known
23 risk of harm associated with exposure, even for brief
24 intervals, to sound at high decibel levels;
25
26 (ii) Selling, marketing or advertising the Headsets without a
27 mechanism by which the user can readily and easily
28 determine the decibel levels being emitted by the

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3987 REBEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

1 Headsets and thereby be made aware of the safe time
2 limits (if any) for use of the Headsets at the higher
3 volume settings;

4
5 (iii) Any other conduct which the Court determines
6 warranted so as to prevent the commission of unfair
7 competition by Defendants.

8
9 g. As to the Fourth through Sixth Causes of Action, for an order
10 of disgorgement;

11
12 h. For costs incurred herein;

13
14 i. For prejudgment interest;

15
16 j. For reasonable attorneys' fees;

17
18 k. For all general, special, and equitable relief to which the
19 Plaintiffs and the members of the Class are entitled by law.

20
21 DATED: October 11, 2006

22 WASSERMAN, COMDEN &
23 CASSELMAN, L.L.P.

24 By: 

25 MELISSA M. HARNETT

26 Attorneys for Bruce Schiller and the Putative Class
27
28

OCT-13-2006 10:19AM FROM-

T-428 P.030/051 F-710

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury.

DATED: October 10, 2006

**WASSERMAN, COMDEN &
CASSELMAN, L.L.P.**

By: 

MELISSA M. HARNETT
Attorneys for Michael Jones, Christopher Freeman,
and the Putative Class

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
3567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 380
POST OFFICE BOX 7033
TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

OCT-13-2006 10:19AM FROM-

T-429 P.031/051 F-710

OCT-11-2006 05:35PM FROM-

CT 10 2006 2:48 PM FR WASSERMAN COMDEN CASSELMAN 4898 TO

34822999

P.37

COPY

1 MELISSA M. HARNETT (Bar No. 164309; mharnett@wccclaw.com)
 2 WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 3 5567 Reseda Boulevard, Suite 330
 4 Post Office Box 7033
 5 Tarzana, California 91357-7033
 6 Telephone: (818) 705-6800 • (323) 872-0995
 7 Facsimile: (818) 345-0162

CONFIRMED COPY
 OF ORIGINAL FILED
 Los Angeles Superior Court

OCT 10 2006

John A. Chang, Executive Officer/Clerk

By Deputy

5 THE GARCIA LAW FIRM
 6 Stephen M. Garcia, State Bar No. 123338
 7 Sarina M. Hinson, State Bar No. 228255
 8 David M. Medby, State Bar No. 227401
 9 One World Trade Center, Suite 1950
 10 Long Beach, California 90831
 11 Telephone: (562) 216-5270
 12 Facsimile: (562) 216-5271

13 Attorneys for BRUCE SCHILLER, and
 14 VARIOUS PARTIES

FILE BY FAX

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WASSERMAN, COMDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 5567 RESEDA BOULEVARD, SUITE 330
 POST OFFICE BOX 7033
 TARZANA, CALIFORNIA 91357-7033

15 BRUCE SCHILLER, an individual and on
 16 Behalf of all Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

18 PLANTRONICS INC., a Delaware
 19 corporation, and DOES 1-50,

Defendants.

CASE NO.

BC360076

PLAINTIFF BRUCE SCHILLER'S
 AFFIDAVIT PER CIVIL CODE
 SECTION 1780(c)

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

OCT-13-2006 10:19AM FROM: T-428 P.032/051 F-710
 OCT-10-2006 14:26 FROM: MAJOR JAL PUST IN JEROME
 OCT 09 2006 5:29 PM FR WASSERMAN CONDEN CH5581 4030 1 10000.00.

AFFIDAVIT

I, BRUCE SCHILLER, declare and affirm as follows:

1. I am an individual consumer who purchased a Plantronics Bluetooth Headset for my personal use in or about the Summer of 2006. At the time of the transaction, I was located in Los Angeles, California. At the time of transactions, I lived in the county of Los Angeles. I continue to live in the county of Los Angeles.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 12 day of October, 2006, at Los Angeles, California.


 BRUCE SCHILLER

WASSERMAN, CONDEN & CASSELMAN, L.L.P.
 3567 RESERVA BOULEVARD, SUITE 390
 POST OFFICE BOX 7039
 TALLAHASSEE, CALIFORNIA 91387-7039

783743.1